

91 00834

6/28/91

# San Francisco Jail Population Management Plan

May 22, 1991

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUN 19 1991

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction .....	2
Jail Population Management Plan.....	4
Appendix	
A: Contacts .....	15
B: Bibliography.....	17

1. The first part of the report is a general introduction to the subject of the study. It discusses the importance of the study and the objectives of the research. It also provides a brief overview of the methodology used in the study.

2. The second part of the report is a detailed description of the study. It includes a description of the sample, the data collection methods, and the analysis techniques used. It also includes a discussion of the results of the study.

3. The third part of the report is a discussion of the results of the study. It discusses the findings of the study and their implications for the field of study. It also includes a discussion of the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

4. The fourth part of the report is a conclusion. It summarizes the findings of the study and provides a final statement on the importance of the study.

LIST OF CONTENTS

## **CRIMINAL JUSTICE ADMINISTRATORS' GROUP**

Dennis Aftergut, City Attorney's Office  
Ron Albers, Public Defender's Office  
Jeff Brown, Public Defender's Office  
Jon Dearman, Presiding Judge, Civil Superior Courts  
Peter Goldstein, Director, Budget Staff, Mayor's Office  
Tony Hall, Municipal Court Administration  
Jim Harrigan, Sheriff's Legal Counsel  
Michael Hennessey, Sheriff, San Francisco Sheriff's Department  
Linda Klee, District Attorney's Office  
Newton Lam, Mayor's Office  
Tomar Mason, Municipal Court  
Lucy Kelley McCabe, Presiding Judge, Criminal Superior Court  
Larry Meredith, Forensic Services, San Francisco Dept. of Public Health  
Kate Monico-Klein, Forensic Services, San Francisco Dept. of Public Health  
Robert Podesta, District Attorney's Office  
Paul Principe, District Attorney's Office  
Ron Quidachay, Municipal Court  
Tony Ribera, San Francisco Police Department  
Tanya Saul, Forensic Services, San Francisco Dept. of Public Health  
Arlene Sauser, San Francisco Probation Department  
Arlo Smith, District Attorney's Office  
Amie Sowell, Mayor's Office  
Samuel Yockey, Mayor's Office

## **PROJECT TEAM**

Dr. Alan S. Kalmanoff, Project Director  
Ms. Susan Jensen, Project Manager  
Ms. Myla Reyes, Project Coordinator  
Dr. David Moulton, Data Specialist  
Mr. David Dupree, Courts Specialist  
Ms. Jane Yee, Population Analyst  
Mr. Palmer Stinson, Law Enforcement Specialist

THESE ARE THE ONLY TWO COPIES OF  
THE ORIGINALS OF THE  
DOCUMENTS WHICH WERE  
DEPOSITED IN THE  
LIBRARY OF THE  
CONGRESS OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
ON THE 15TH DAY OF  
JANUARY 1892

WILLIAM L. GAY

THESE ARE THE ONLY TWO COPIES OF  
THE ORIGINALS OF THE  
DOCUMENTS WHICH WERE  
DEPOSITED IN THE  
LIBRARY OF THE  
CONGRESS OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
ON THE 15TH DAY OF  
JANUARY 1892

WILLIAM L. GAY

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the last of a three-part report. The first report identified areas to be improved. The second report outlined solutions which were presented to the Board of Education. The solutions were a response to the Board of Education's request for a plan to improve the quality of education. This report outlines the solutions that the Board of Education has approved. The Board of Education will monitor the progress of the plan.

The following are the chief elements of the plan approved by the Board of Education:

- Proposal 1: The Board of Education will appoint a Manager.
- Proposal 2: The California Justice Administration System (CJAS) will provide a Voluntary Program for Coordinating the California Justice System with the State of California.
- Proposal 3: Continue to improve the quality and quantity of Police Reports and Forensic Reports and Police Reports.
- Proposal 4: Upgrade the Office of the County Clerk and the Municipal Court.
- Proposal 5: Set up a program to improve the FLETC Program.
- Proposal 6: Implement a Plan to Improve the Quality of Traffic Courts.
- Proposal 7: Expedite the Trial of Cases in the Program.

## Executive Summary

- Proposal 1: The Board of Education will appoint a Manager.
- Proposal 2: The California Justice Administration System (CJAS) will provide a Voluntary Program for Coordinating the California Justice System with the State of California.
- Proposal 3: Continue to improve the quality and quantity of Police Reports and Forensic Reports and Police Reports.
- Proposal 4: Upgrade the Office of the County Clerk and the Municipal Court.
- Proposal 5: Set up a program to improve the FLETC Program.
- Proposal 6: Implement a Plan to Improve the Quality of Traffic Courts.
- Proposal 7: Expedite the Trial of Cases in the Program.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the last of a three-phase project. The first report identified causes of jail overcrowding. The next report outlined solutions which were proposed strategies to regulate jail overcrowding. The solutions were a response to the causes of overcrowding identified in the first phase. This Population Management Plan resulted from the solutions agreed upon by CJAG, and will be submitted to the federal court.

The following are the chief elements of the plan derived from extensive deliberation by CJAG and Consultants.

- Proposal 1:** Data Program and Jail Population Manager
- Proposal 2:** The Criminal Justice Administrators Group (CJAG) Provides a Voluntary Forum for Coordinating the Criminal Justice System as it Relates to Jail Overcrowding
- Proposal 3:** Continue to Improve Timeliness and Quality of Police Reports and Prosecution Review of Police Reports and Felony Charges
- Proposal 4:** Upgrade the OR Project in Concert with the Municipal Court.
- Proposal 5:** Seek to Improve the FTA Program
- Proposal 6:** Inter-County Pact to Limit the Problem of Traffic Holds
- Proposal 7:** Expedited Trial Management Program

**Proposal 8:**

**Improved Use of County Parole**

**Proposal 9:**

**Prioritize Presentence Investigation Reports for In-Custody Cases**

**Proposal 10:**

**Expand the Use of Electronic Monitoring**

**Proposal 11:**

**Construct, Remodel and/or Renovate Facilities**

Introduction

There is a small amount of water in the  
reservoir, but it is not enough to  
supply the needs of the  
population. The water is  
very dirty and is not  
fit for drinking.

1. The water is very dirty  
2. The water is not enough  
3. The water is not fit for drinking

# EXERCISES

The water is very dirty and is not  
fit for drinking. The water is not  
enough to supply the needs of the  
population. The water is very dirty  
and is not fit for drinking.

1. The water is very dirty  
2. The water is not enough  
3. The water is not fit for drinking  
4. The water is very dirty  
5. The water is not enough  
6. The water is not fit for drinking  
7. The water is very dirty  
8. The water is not enough  
9. The water is not fit for drinking  
10. The water is very dirty  
11. The water is not enough  
12. The water is not fit for drinking

# Introduction

---



## INTRODUCTION

The city and county of San Francisco contracted with the Institute for Law and Policy Planning (ILPP) to facilitate development of a Jail Population Management Plan to comply with a federal court order. This draft report is the last of a three-phase planning process to develop a five-year jail population management plan. The study results in a plan for San Francisco to manage and limit the flow of inmates through its detention facilities and to replace special provisions now employed as a result of the court order.

The plan is a result of CJAG deliberations and is "CJAG's plan" (i.e., various findings and recommendations made by Consultants were modified through CJAG's deliberations). The final plan represents a consensus by CJAG members as to what can be accomplished.

There have been three phases to the project. The first identified and analyzed factors contributing to jail overcrowding which resulted in a report on causes of overcrowding. The second presented solutions through the development of proposed strategies to regulate jail crowding factors. The third, an implementation plan, is set forth herein. Each of the three reports began with a draft presented to the Criminal Justice Administrators' Group (CJAG). After CJAG input, a final version is issued.

The proposals have been developed to address causes identified in the "Causes of Overcrowding Report," and solutions identified in the "Solutions to Overcrowding Report." The proposals are presented not by priority or by the greatest impact on bed savings, but according to flow from arrest to sentencing.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE PLAN

The plan is organized as follows. The underlying cause and proposed solution are set forth together. This is followed by a proposal and implementation plan elucidating the preceding solution.

The proposals and planning material have several other organizational aspects that are designed to make this report a "workbook" for implementing the study's recommendations.

First, each proposal is numbered so as to facilitate keeping track. Second, each proposal is preceded by the underlying cause and proposed solution.

Each proposal is described in a general way with "Program Elements" further breaking down most proposals, and showing more specific aspects.

An implementation plan follows each proposal. In the implementation plan, the first item covered is the "Responsible Agency" or agencies. This element points to that agency or entity that is best suited to implementing the recommendation.

The plan also sets forth a number for "Estimated Beds Saved" upon implementation. Calculations were made using collected data, information from the tracking analysis, interviews, and information from comparable programs used elsewhere. Estimates are rough predictions and are strictly for planning purposes (i.e., there is "no science," only educated guesses). Consultants estimate up to 420 beds saved or, with new construction of the 380-bed Work Furlough Facility, 800 total.

The next aspect of the planning material is "Estimated Cost" which sets forth the staffing, funding, or other budget items, required for implementation. Cost is a difficult planning category in that so



San Francisco Jail Population Management Plan

many variables and estimates enter into the determination of most implementation costs. In some cases, Consultants have derived costs from specific interviews with agency heads, and/or analysis of recent county and state budgets. In other cases, Consultants developed cost estimates de novo. In some cases, cost was presented as a rough estimate or range, often including the Consultants' best estimates of the number of new or transferred personnel required for implementation. These staff costs are typically expressed as "FTEs," or "full time employees" - meaning a single full-time position.

As part of the implementation plan, for each proposal, there is a section for "Comments." This section provides material connecting the proposal to the implementation plan where the logical connections are not obvious.

The final element in the implementation plan is the "Status" of the proposal and its implementation. Under "Status," Consultants have noted any progress already made and left space for the CJAG members to add information over time, maintaining a current and updated tracking commentary for each proposal. Thus, this report can be used over time as a workbook and progress report.

Lined area for handwritten notes or comments.



# Jail Population Management Plan



**CAUSE A:**

There is a lack of authoritative, readily accessible, system-wide data that are available and useful for jail population management.

**SOLUTION A1:**

Data Program and Jail Population Manager

**PROPOSAL 1**

Beginning in FY 1991-92, San Francisco will provide a personal computer and statistical program and a jail population manager (JPM) to sample jail flow quarterly. The quarterly sample should employ approximately 400 cases and obtain time of intake and release, method of release, and charges and disposition. Information will be reported to the Criminal Justice Administrators' Group (CJAG). This will provide CJAG with information necessary to discuss and resolve overcrowding issues.

**PROGRAM ELEMENTS**

The population management system should include the following elements:

- a. The jail population manager position will be the approximate equivalent of a 0.5 full time employee (FTE) for this proposal. The remaining time will be used to help CJAG coordinate the criminal justice system (see Proposal 2). This position will report to the Sheriff's Office and provide support for CJAG.
- b. A quarterly tracking study will be conducted which should show average length of stay, by charge and release mode, failure to appear and warrants/holds data. It should track cases through each stage of adjudication.

- c. The jail population manager will perform this analysis and explain it to CJAG members. Significant population management issues should be noted, such as system clogging and coordination problems. This will result in CJAG agenda items, meetings, special studies, etc.
- d. A profile of all in custody on a single day should be performed each quarter.

**RESPONSIBLE AGENCY**

Sheriff's Department.

**ESTIMATED COST**

The Sheriff's Department will use existing resources to carry out this function.

**ESTIMATED BEDS SAVED**

Exact number of beds cannot be calculated because this proposal is general. The ability to effectively monitor the system should result in large system-wide bed savings.

**STATUS**

CJAG has been meeting for four months and has some experience in dealing with data to identify crowding issues. CJAG has been developing into a "real group" that actively solves problems.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**SOLUTION B1:** The Criminal Justice Administrators Group (CJAG) Provides a Voluntary Forum for Coordinating the Criminal Justice System as it Relates to Jail Overcrowding

**CJAG is a voluntary association of justice system department heads that will provide a forum for discussing issues relating to jail overcrowding. The Sheriff will review the status of the jail population with CJAG from time to time and CJAG members will advise the association as to what changes, if any, can be made in the justice system that are consistent with each member's duties and obligations to crime victims and the general public.**

CJAG depends on the cooperation of its members and is not an official legislative body or the creation of a legislative body. CJAG includes executive and judicial representatives but does not include any member of a legislative body serving in his or her official capacity.

- a. The JPM will act as a facilitator for CJAG, perform data analysis and present findings to the CJAG (see Proposal 1). The JPM will report to the Sheriff's Department.
- b. The presiding judges will be looked to for leadership.
- c. CJAG will provide an opportunity for department heads to share views on costs and issues concerning the jail. However, CJAG's role will be advisory and it will not make or enforce policy.

d. It is the goal of CJAG to find alternatives to the extraordinary prisoner release mechanisms arising from the existing federal court order. Consensus among CJAG members is central to effective coordination of scarce jail resources and of release programs.

Mayor's Office, Municipal Court, Superior Court, San Francisco Police Department, District Attorney's Office, City Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office, Sheriff's Department, Probation Department and Health Department.

The city will use existing resources to perform this function.

Exact number of beds cannot be calculated. The ability to effectively monitor the system will result in a variety of system-wide bed savings.

CJAG has been meeting regularly throughout this project. A continuing active role for CJAG will be critical to managing the system effectively.

[illegible]



**SOLUTION C1:** Continue to Improve Timeliness and Quality of Police Reports and Prosecution Review of Police Reports and Felony Charges

### PROPOSAL 3

The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) has already taken greater responsibility for helping with overcrowding by making the timing and quality of documentation in police reports a high priority. Resulting improvements in training, supervision and management and an increase in allocated resources should reduce police, prosecution and overall system workload and result in more timely reports, better documentation and consistency, and a lower "drop" rate on felonies. (See the Coro Foundation's report, "The Impact of Proposition 115 on the San Francisco Police Department," October 1990.)

To improve the overall quality of the police reports and lower the number of felonies dropped, a night district attorney will be available as a resource for early screening of felony arrests.

## PROGRAM ELEMENTS

- b. A district attorney will be available on weeknights as a resource to the police inspectors for all felony arrests. The on-call deputy district attorney would screen many felony charges 12 to 24 hours sooner than at present.

**RESPONSIBLE AGENCY**

**San Francisco Police Department and District Attorney's Office.**

### ESTIMATED COST

Approximately \$100,000 in funds will be made available through police alternative funding. Lower police and prosecution workload should result, enabling better use of existing staff.

### ESTIMATED BEDS SAVED

**Up to 60 beds, if two-thirds of felony arrests ultimately dismissed are not booked.**

## STATUS

The SFPD has made progress toward improving their police reports. Four weeks have already been added to SFPD academy training, part of which will be used to improve report writing skills. The SFPD has expressed strong support for a night district attorney, and a willingness to reassign resources.

[illegible]



**CAUSE D1:** The OR Bail Project is not structured to help assure a more consistent OR release rate for nonviolent felonies and misdemeanors among various judges because the project uses no objective points or criteria, does not recommend OR release and excludes certain cases. Few supervision options for Court OR are available.

**SOLUTION D1:** Upgrade the OR Project in Concert with the Municipal Court.

#### PROPOSAL 4

San Francisco will seek to upgrade its OR Project through a step-by-step approach, each step to be taken only with the concurrence of the Municipal Court. The OR Project will be managed by the Sheriff's Department or Probation Department.

#### PROGRAM ELEMENTS

- a. Reorganize OR under the Sheriff's Department or Probation Department. Encourage greater court reliance by early and continuous court consultation. Combine all OR and other pretrial release mechanism operations in a single, well-documented and publicized pretrial program, with one budget and one source of direction and control.
- b. The reorganized OR Project should tie the program by computer to prior records and police reporting, and develop more formal program documentation of policy and procedures with participation by CJAG.
- c. Aim to interview/process 100 percent of all bookings; assist judges in individually evaluating cases by assigning weights to objective guidelines for release/propensity to appear and for ability to contact; make recommendations to the bench for and against OR release, and for supervision conditions, testing, electronic monitoring, etc.; update, verify and renew

cases regularly. In considering each case, judges will continue to exercise their discretion as required by law.

- d. To avoid any appearance of advocacy for release, tie all recommendations to the bench to a risk-assessment approach based on the objective guidelines, continue to revise guidelines and tie weighting to FTA rates and other measures of OR system performance (i.e., employ FTA data to monitor and regulate and vary guidelines and practice).
- e. In consultation with the Municipal Court, seek to initiate on a trial basis a limited program by which the OR Project approaches an assigned Municipal Court judge to OR those arrestees now cited out. If the program is successful, it may be expanded with the agreement of the Municipal Court.
- f. In conjunction with the District Attorney's Office and the arresting agencies, the Municipal Court will expedite probable cause hearings.

#### RESPONSIBLE AGENCY

Sheriff's Department or Adult Probation Department and Municipal Court.

#### ESTIMATED COST

The existing budget for the OR Project is \$800,000. It could cost more to set up new procedures. There could be some overhead savings by setting up the program in an existing department.

#### ESTIMATED BEDS SAVED

Up to 40 beds if ten percent of OR releases were released earlier by the OR Project. Based on the Special Master's estimate, 150 to 200 beds for citation releases now done under Court Order. Total up to 190 to 240.

#### STATUS

There is an existing, albeit modest, OR Project of long standing.







- a. Convene a Bay Area Criminal Justice Conference.
- b. Seek to draw up an inter-county pact (Joint Powers Agreement - JPA) to eliminate the multi-county problem of traffic holds and warrants/holds on nonserious offenders.
- c. Procedures will be sought to clear holds on minor crimes by phone, citation or conditional citation to the other county's custody, for quick pick-up or release.

**San Francisco Police Department, District Attorney's Office,  
Courts.**

Minimal; saves money. State and federal funding may be an option.

Five beds.

No progress yet.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.



[illegible]







[illegible]



Electronic monitoring use by the Sheriff will be increased for expanded County Parole.

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.



This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.



## Appendix

---



## APPENDIX A: CONTACTS

Rita Adrian, Director of Neighborhood Programs for Community Boards

Dennis Aftergut, Chief Assistant City Attorney

Wayne Anderson, Domestic Violence Diversion, Probation Department

Jim Austen, National Center on Crime and Delinquency

Hon. Lee D. Baxter, Municipal Court

Hon. Jack K. Berman, Criminal Superior Court

Lt. Richard Bignardi, Sheriff's Department

Hon. Anne Bouliane, Municipal Court

Allen Breed, Special Master

Jeff Brown, Public Defender

Carmen Bush, Supervisor, Community Services Division, Probation Department

Hon. Thomas Dandurand, Criminal Superior Court

Hon. John Dearman, Presiding Judge, Civil Superior Courts

Lt. Jan Dempsy, Sheriff's Department

Hon. Joseph A. Desmond, Municipal Court

Capt. Mary Ann deSouza, Sheriff's Department

Hon. Herbert Donaldson, Municipal Court

John Drago, Project 20 /San Francisco Alternative Sentencing Program

Skip Duranczyk, Administrator, San Mateo County Release on Own Recognizance Program

Sgt. Richard Dyer, Public Information Officer, Sheriff's Department

Sgt. Phil Fairbrother, Investigative Services, Internal Affairs, Sheriff's Department

Kevin Foster, County Parole

Armando Garcia, Drug Diversion Officer, Probation Department

Lt. Richard Garibaldi, Sheriff's Department

Peter Goldstein, Director, Budget Staff, Mayor's Office

Tony Hall, Municipal Court Administration

Deputy Gerald Haran, Sheriff's Department

James Harrigan, Sheriff's Legal Counsel

Sheriff Mike Hennessey, Sheriff's Department

Paula Itaya, Chief Deputy, Criminal Division, Superior Court

Hon. Charles J. James, Municipal Court

Lt. Barry Johnson, San Francisco Police Department

John Kaye, Senior Analyst, San Francisco Police Department

Peter Keane, Chief Assistant Public Defender

Lt. Allen Kennedy, Sheriff's Department

Capt. Carl Kochler, County Jail #3, Sheriff's Department

Newton Lam, Special Assistant to the Mayor in area of Public Safety

Deputy Sheriff Martin Lee, Work Furlough

Will Leong, Pretrial Diversion Project

Derek Lott, Program Coordinator, Jail Psychiatric Services

Hon. Lenard Louie, Criminal Superior Court

Hon. William Mallen, Presiding Judge, Municipal Court

Lt. Dave Maron, San Francisco Police Department

Hon. Tomar Mason, Municipal Court



Hon. Lucy Kelley McCabe, Presiding Judge, Criminal Superior Court

Karen Moen, California Community on Dispute Services

Hon. Mary C. Morgan, Municipal Court

Paul Morse, Inspector, San Francisco Police Department

Hon. Philip J. Moscone, Municipal Court

Hon. J. Dominique Olcomendy, Municipal Court

Gordon Park-Li, Clerk-Administrator, Municipal Courts

Hon. Claude D. Perasso, Criminal Superior Court

Deputy Sheriff John Pesenti, Sheriff's Work Alternative Program

Dr. Tom Peters, Head of Forensic Services, San Francisco Dept. of Public Health

Paul Principe, Assistant Chief District Attorney

Hon. Ronald Evans Quidachay, Assistant Presiding Judge, Municipal Court

Irving Reichert, Director, OR Project

Lt. Tony Ribera, Commanding Officer, Fiscal Division, San Francisco Police Department

Alison Riker, National Center on Institutions and Alternatives

Tanya Saul, Program Evaluator, Department of Public Health

Arlene Sauser, Chief Adult Probation Officer, Probation Department

Kristin Segabarth, National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies

Hon. Lillian K. Sing, Municipal Court

Hon. Dorothy Von Beroldingen, Municipal Court

Sgt. John Walsh, Sheriff's Department

Christine West, Program Director, Jail Psychiatric Services

Carol Wilkins, Deputy Mayor of Finance

Hon. Raymond D. Williamson, Criminal Superior Court

Sam Yockey, Controller, City and County of San Francisco

Robert Zaragosa, Chief Deputy, Sheriff's Department



National Council on Crime and Delinquency, San Francisco Jail Needs Assessment Final Report, October, 1988.

- "Position Paper on San Francisco Jail Overcrowding Options," August, 1989.

National Institute of Corrections, "Pretrial Release: Concepts, Issues, and Strategies for Improvement," Research in Corrections, October, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_, Technical Assistance Report (TA 87-P067), City and County of San Francisco, California, February 17, 1987.

National Institute of Justice, Alleviating Jail Crowding: A Systems Perspective, November, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_, Dealing Effectively with Crowded Jails: A Manual for Judges, July, 1986.

Eric Pfeiffer, "Court of Last Resort," San Francisco Examiner, January 25, 1987

Irving Reichert, OR Project data, December, 1990.

Irving Reichert, Memo to OR Board re: Decline in ORs, November 6, 1990.

San Francisco, "SANJIS Joint Application Design Results," September 18, 1990

San Francisco Adult Probation Department, Annual Report 1988-1989, April 27, 1990.

San Francisco (city and county of), 1988-89 Civil Grand Jury Reports, California.

San Francisco County Parole Information

a. Sample Parole Applicant Investigation Report.

b. San Francisco County Parole Annual Report, June 30, 1989.

c. Discretionary Parole Application Procedures, October 12, 1990.

d. Administrative Fee Computations, November 21, 1990.

e. Sample Application Denial/Acceptance Form Letter.

f. Sample Order Granting Parole.

g. Sample Order Granting Home Detention.

h. San Francisco Sheriff's Presentence Conditional Release Program Rules and Regulations, December 11, 1990.

i. San Francisco Sheriff's Home Detention Program Rules and Regulations, November 21, 1990.

j. San Francisco County Parole Statistical Summary July 1, 1989 to December 7, 1990.

k. San Francisco County Parole Programs Descriptions, December 12, 1990.

San Francisco Department of Public Health Forensic Services, "(Draft) Preliminary Findings of Client Overlap Study and Jail Population Study," November 7, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_, Final Draft: Jail Alternative Pilot Project: Program Evaluation Report for July-December, 1990.

San Francisco Mayor's Office, Mayor's Budget Summary, FY 1990-1991, June 1, 1990.

San Francisco Municipal Court, Misdemeanor - Felony Bail Schedule, September 12, 1990

San Francisco Police Department, "Citation Release Policy and Procedures; Warrant Arrest Procedures," April 24, 1985.

- "Incident Report Writing Manual," October 14, 1987.



## APPENDIX B: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen Breed, First Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, September 8, 1986.

- Second Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, November 18, 1986.

- Third Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, February 15, 1987.

- Fourth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, May 10, 1987.

- Fifth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, August 30, 1987.

- Sixth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, November 23, 1987.

- Seventh Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance, April 7, 1988.

- Eighth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, July 15, 1988.

- Ninth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, October 18, 1988.

- Tenth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, February 21, 1989.

- Addendum to Tenth Progress Report, April 3, 1989.

- Eleventh Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, December 20, 1989.

- Twelfth Progress Report of Special Master on Defendants' State of Compliance with Consent Decree, August 22, 1990.

California Community Dispute Service, Annual Report 1989-1990, and Pamphlet of general information

Pat Christensen, "Perspective: Resolving Neighborhood Conflicts," San Francisco Independent, 1988

Community Boards Pamphlets

CORO Foundation, The Impact of Proposition 115 on the San Francisco Police Department, October, 1990.

Crime Prevention Coalition, "Neighborhood Mediation Dissolves Tensions, Strengthens Community," Catalyst, Vol. 8, No. 8, October, 1988

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, "Crowding at the Cook County Jail: Historical Perspective and Current Strategies," October, 1989.

Institute for Law and Policy Planning, San Francisco County Minor Jail Needs Assessment, 1983.

Anne Kaartunen, "Neighborhood Notes," Visitacion Valley Grapevine, Vol. III, No. 7, August 1988

Chris Lutes, "Talk Out", Campus Life, April 1988

Howard Messing, "NIC Technical Assistance Report #90-J1316," December, 1990.



San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project, "Eligibility Requirements for Diversion through the San Francisco Pretrial Diversion Project," March 1990

San Francisco Public Defender's Office, 1989-90 Fiscal Year Annual Report, 1989-1990.  
- 1989-90 Fiscal Year Supplement to the Annual Report, 1989-1990.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department, "Analysis of Budget Issues," November, 1989.

- Average Daily Population Data: October, 1987 - December, 1990.

- Bail Schedule, San Francisco County Jail, September 21, 1990.

- "Daily Prisoner Count Summary," November 30, 1990.

- "Daily Prisoner Count Summary," December 3, 1990.

- Proposal to San Francisco Board of Supervisors re: Fiscal/Policy Considerations Related to Sheriff's Department (Prop. 52 proposal of 1/2/90), January 17, 1990.

- Memo brief of S.W.A.P. and Work Furlough Unit, 1990

- San Francisco County Jail #1 Citation Quick Reference Sheet, February, 1988.

Special Program of the Adult Probation Department, Assorted Pamphlets re: Project 20 Community Service Program

Stone v. City and County of San Francisco, C78-2774 WHO

Marilee Strong, "Court of First Resort," San Francisco Focus, January 1985

---

Robert Zaragoza, Interoffice Memo to Hall of Justice Custody Division re: Overcrowding in Individual Housing Units at CJ #1, June 15, 1989, amended September 27, 1989.





U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



CJ24904456